



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The
American Historical Review

THE NEW HAVEN MEETING OF THE AMERICAN
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

ALL who habitually attend the sessions of the American Historical Association seemed to agree that its fourteenth annual meeting, held at New Haven on December 28, 29 and 30, 1898, was the most interesting and successful in its history. After each of its recent meetings similar expressions have been current; and it is evident that the Association is rapidly moving forward, with constant increase of activity and usefulness. Its members, who three years ago numbered 629, now number about twelve hundred. The treasurer's report, submitted at New Haven, showed that the funds of the society amounted to more than \$11,000, and that they had increased about \$1,500 during the preceding twelvemonth. Still better evidences of progress are presented by the new activities and responsibilities which the organization, while maintaining its traditional functions, is annually assuming. The foremost place among these new duties we may, without apology, assign to those which the society has undertaken with reference to the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW.

From its inception, in the summer of 1895, the REVIEW was sustained by the aid of a three years' guarantee on the part of a body of generous friends of historical learning. At the Cleveland meeting of the American Historical Association proposals were made looking toward the substitution of that body for the Association of Guarantors, or toward securing, upon some other basis, the benefits of union. While favoring the general project, the Association did not feel at liberty to commit its members to any definite plan without further opportunity to consult them. Accordingly a vote was adopted whereby each member of the Association was to be supplied with the first two numbers of the REVIEW issued after the ex-

piration of the guarantee fund (those for October 1898 and January 1899) while a definite decision of the question was postponed to the New Haven meeting. Upon that occasion it was concluded, in view of the excellent showing made by the treasurer, that the Association could safely, without increasing its annual dues, enter into the desired relations with the REVIEW. It was, therefore, agreed that the Association would subscribe for the REVIEW for all its members, assuming, however, no further pecuniary responsibility; and that hereafter the members of the Board of Editors, as their terms expired, should be elected by the Council of the Association. This agreement may, upon one year's notice, be terminated by either party. By this generous action on the part of the Association the REVIEW is assured of permanence, while its editors retain all desirable freedom of action.

Among the other transactions which must be noted as steps of progress was the formation of a committee for the historical study of colonial dependencies, and especially of the methods employed by other countries in their management, and in the training of men for their administration. The chairman of this committee is Professor Henry E. Bourne of Cleveland; its other members, appointed for reasons of obvious fitness, are Professor Bernard Moses of the University of California, Professor H. Morse Stephens of Cornell University, Professor George M. Wrong of the University of Toronto and Mr. Frederick Wells Williams, instructor in Oriental history in Yale University. This committee, whose investigations may properly be expected to be of much interest and utility to the general American public, will probably bring out a somewhat elaborate historical and bibliographical report late in the present year, before the next meeting of the Association, and perhaps before the next meeting of Congress.

The Association took another important step in the appointing of a bibliographical committee,—Mr. William E. Foster of the Providence Public Library, chairman, Mr. J. N. Larned of Buffalo, Mr. Reuben G. Thwaites, secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Mr. George Iles of New York and Mr. A. Howard Clark, assistant secretary of the Association,—whose function is to supervise the bibliographical work of the Association, often an extensive part of its publishing activity, and to devise and execute plans of larger usefulness in this direction. Not less important to the future progress of the Association is the creation of a numerous "General Committee," the members of which, under the chairmanship of Professor Herbert B. Adams, Secretary of the Association, are to take care of its local interests in their respective states or

cities, to act as a committee on membership, to answer historical inquiries, or to put members into communication with those who can answer them, and to serve the Secretary and the Association in various ways. The Association also, reviving its bestowal of an annual prize for a historical monograph, gave it the appropriate name of the Justin Winsor Prize in memory of the third president of the society. Professor Frederick J. Turner, of Wisconsin, was made chairman of the committee on this prize.

These are the new activities of the society. Of the tasks which it had already undertaken, there was none which, apparently, was regarded with so general interest as that of the Committee of Seven on the teaching of history in secondary schools. Unquestionably a considerable part of this manifestation of interest on the part of the audiences was due to the fact that the New England History Teachers' Association was gathered together in New Haven at the same time. At the Cleveland meeting the Committee of Seven had made a preliminary report which, without yet formulating conclusions in perfect detail, had impressed all hearers with the thoroughness of the committee in its search for information as to the actual facts of historical teaching in schools, with its determination to make practical recommendations, based on experience and on the actual situation, and with the certainty that the results of its labors, when finally brought forward, would prove to be of high professional value. This impression was confirmed by what the committee presented at New Haven. From their report, nearly completed after many and arduous sessions, the chairman, Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin of Michigan, read considerable extracts at one of the sessions. So general was the desire to hear more, that a special time and place were appointed in order to give opportunity for this.

The report first gave an account of the work of the committee, and a brief statement of the conditions found to exist in the schools of the country. It discussed the educational value of history and its place in the curriculum. Declining to recommend the use of a short course in general history, the committee recommended that the historical teaching in secondary schools relate to one or more of four tracts or periods of history: Ancient History, including Oriental beginnings and continuing the study into the medieval period so far as to the end of the reign of Charlemagne; Later Medieval and Modern European History; English History; and American History. The report discussed the various methods which might best be employed in teaching each of these portions of history, laying stress upon the value of history in cultivating the judgment and reasoning powers.

Views upon the training of teachers were also expressed in the report; and it concluded with a section, toward which in a sense all the rest had led, upon college entrance requirements in history. The recommendation of the committee was that history should be treated on terms of equality with the other subjects now required; and they developed their views as to how this proposition could or should be worked out under the varying systems of requirements for entrance which prevail in American colleges. The public discussion of the report was hampered by the fact that, after all, it was presented only in fragments. President Levermore of Adelphi College urged that, so far as presented, it seemed to ignore the standing dilemma in which secondary schools are placed by the enthusiastic advocates of this or that study,—that if the schools should try to meet the sum of all their demands, the scholar's whole time would be engrossed many times over. But as to the details of what will be found, or what may not be found, in the committee's report, it is possible for us to refer to the text of the report itself; for it was concluded not to wait upon the slow operations of the Government Printing Office, but to bring out the report, as a duodecimo volume of 150 or 175 pages, through a publisher (the Macmillan Co.) this spring. The volume, which surely will be ardently expected, will contain, beside the chapters already mentioned, a series of appendixes or special contributions. One will present typical replies to the committee's circulars; another, typical school-programmes. Another, by Miss Lucy Salmon, professor in Vassar College, a member of the committee, will delineate from abundant personal observation the methods and the results of historical teaching in the German gymnasias. Others will deal in a similar manner, though less elaborately, with the systems in vogue in France, England and Canada; others still with the possibilities and the appropriate methods of historical instruction in schools of lower and of elementary grade. An extensive bibliography of the study and teaching of history will also be appended. The section relating to historical requirements for entrance to college will also be used as a report on that subject to the National Educational Association's committee on uniform entrance requirements, the committee of which Mr. A. F. Nightingale of Chicago is chairman.

Another report formally presented to the Association was that of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, read by its chairman, Professor J. Franklin Jameson. The Commission had expected to present on this occasion the manuscript of their edition of the Correspondence of John C. Calhoun. But almost at the last moment a considerable mass of additional material was placed at their disposal

and still more appeared to be within reach. To secure the utmost possible completeness seemed more important than haste. The Commission, therefore, felt obliged to defer till next Christmas the presentation in final shape of this part of their work, and to content themselves at present with a brief report, accompanied with three appendixes. In the first were contained a part of the data respecting historical manuscripts in private hands which have come to their knowledge through replies received to their circulars of inquiry. The second will comprise a list of all letters of Calhoun hitherto printed. The third will be a classified and indexed list of all the items relating to American history (more precisely, Canadian history and that of the United States and its dependencies) which are to be found scattered through the many volumes of the reports of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts and their appendixes.

Much additional interest accrued to the meetings from the presence in New Haven, at the same time, of the American Economic Association. The members of both bodies were alike invited to the reception held by Professor and Mrs. Henry W. Farnam on Tuesday evening. On Wednesday afternoon the session of the economists was devoted to the economic history of the United States. Four papers were read: by Professor Taussig of Harvard on *Some Aspects of the United States Treasury Situation in the Years 1893 to 1897*; by Dr. G. S. Callender of Harvard on *Early Canal, Railway and Banking Enterprises of the States, in Relation to the Growth of Corporations in the United States*; by Professor J. C. Schwab of Yale on *Prices and Price Movements in the Confederate States during the Civil War*; and by Professor C. S. Walker of the Massachusetts Agricultural College on *Recent Economic Changes in the State of Massachusetts*. The morning session of the Historical Association was held in union with the New England History Teachers' Association. Professor H. Morse Stephens of Cornell University opened the session with a plea for the study of Scottish and Irish history, instead of the exclusive study, so usual with regard to the early periods, of the history of South Britain. Professor Clyde A. Duniway of Leland Stanford Junior University followed with a brief address on the appropriate methods for the teaching of history to large classes of undergraduates. In informal remarks on this subject, Dr. A. C. Coolidge of Harvard discussed the respective merits of the plan which requires the use of a text-book with supplementary lectures by the teacher, and of that in which the teacher's lectures furnish merely the necessary outline of facts, to be supplemented by reading on the part of the student. He preferred the latter, as accomplishing more toward carrying the student over

the transition from the text-book work of the schools to the more advanced methods of the upper classes in college.

At the first formal session, that of Wednesday evening, December 28, after an address of welcome by President Dwight of Yale University the president of the Association, Professor George P. Fisher, read his inaugural address, a paper marked, as was to have been expected, on the one hand by clearness of thought, keenness and incisiveness, but on the other hand also by moderation and fairness and good temper, and by admirable literary qualities. It has since been printed in the form of a pamphlet. His theme was, *The Function of the Historian as a Judge of Historic Persons*. Admitting fully the value of the study of society in general, he dwelt upon the interest and importance of the historian's relations to individual personalities, the responsible nature of his duties as a judge, and the frequency with which his office has been abused in past times. Much more can now be learned about historical personages than was formerly possible, and the sense of obligation to be laborious in the search after truth has correspondingly increased. Yet in spite of these advances, we have still to be on our guard constantly against the spirit of hero-worship, against the baser passion for denigration, against the misleading influence of rhetorical fervor, against intolerance of types of character not naturally congenial to the writer, against the love of paradox, against narrow or otherwise faulty ideals of personal worth. Dr. Fisher commented upon the waning influence of party prejudice among writers as one of the most evident signs of improvement in modern historical work. He discussed at some length the question, what shall be the criterion of moral judgment respecting characters in the past. As between those who hold with Lord Acton, that the standard of rectitude to be applied in discussing the characters of the past must be nothing less exigent than the ideal standards of today, and those who would judge men from the point of view of their contemporaries, he contended that, while the most advanced ideal standards must ever be kept in mind, yet in discussing the question of subjective guilt or the degree of personal ill-desert one may rightly take account of the progressive advancement of mankind in moral discernment. He urged the duty of laying chief stress on the principal and vital traits of each human character. In conclusion he dwelt upon the dignity of the historian's calling, as connected with the particular function which had been the theme of his address. The interest of the address was greatly heightened by the many illustrations employed by the reader, illustrations which grace of style and lambent humor never perverted away from justice and from sane conclusions.

After the inaugural address, Professor John M. Vincent of the Johns Hopkins University read an entertaining paper on Municipal Life in the Twelfth Century, his illustrations being chosen from the city of Strassburg. After the conclusion of the evening's exercises the members of the Association were hospitably entertained by a reception on the part of the New Haven Colony Historical Society, in whose ample and dignified building most of the meetings of the Association were held.

The session of Thursday morning was devoted to a conference on fields of history hitherto unduly neglected. Mr. A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard University read a thoughtful and suggestive paper on the Historical Study of the Institutions of the Later Middle Ages. Speaking from the point of view of one whose studies lay in later periods or in the present time, he pointed out first that it is of fundamental importance to be able, discriminating among the various phenomena or tendencies that present themselves in modern times, to seize upon those that are permanent. If the institutions of modern nations are to be criticized chiefly with respect to their adaptation to the characteristics of the nation as formed by the historic past, (for instance, the July Monarchy, so admirable in English eyes, yet rejected as unsuitable by the French), we must pursue more completely the comparative historical study of these permanent tendencies. There are excellent books of English institutional history, and also of French. But as for the comparative study of the history of institutions, it has been pursued mostly with respect to the early periods. For the understanding of modern developments, there is a distinct need of a greater number of comparative studies of the institutions of the later Middle Ages. The services of Gneist, Boutmy and Jenks in this field were meantime acknowledged. It was admitted that the field presented grave difficulties; yet it was urged that the published material was now sufficient to warrant one in entering upon it.

Dr. G. T. Lapsley, by request, remarked upon the institutional development of the border counties of England and Scotland, from the time when, for all that appeared, they might equally well have gravitated toward either kingdom, down through the development of national feeling and the progressive concentration of powers to the time of the formation of the Council of the North. He cautioned against studying the history of these counties as either English or Scottish before they were in fact thus differentiated.

Professor Charles H. Haskins of the University of Wisconsin spoke in cordial support of Mr. Lowell's positions. He dwelt especially upon the importance of the comparative study of English

and French institutions. The early Middle Ages had received relatively too much attention. The later Middle Ages were not only nearer to our own time and thus capable of shedding more light upon it ; they were also important as being the time when national organizations were being formed. Provincial organizations of that age, too, such as the government of the Dukes of Burgundy, the governments of minor states, the governmental systems of the Papacy, all deserved careful study. Yet it was true that the sources for this period had been much less extensively explored and printed, and much monographic work would have to be done before large generalizations could safely be attempted.

The next paper, by Professor Charles M. Andrews of Bryn Mawr College, dealt with the neglected period of American colonial history which begins with the revolution of 1688 and extends to the Albany Congress of 1754. Historians, most of whom have regarded colonial history from the standpoint of the colonies rather than that of the mother country, have amplified upon the earlier period but slighted this. It falls naturally into two divisions, a time of war and stress, 1688-1713, and a time of peace and of economic and political growth, 1713-1754. Both need much more careful study, if we are to understand the condition of the colonies at the close of the period and their relations to the British imperial administration. Mr. Andrews proceeded to describe and discuss the materials, especially the manuscript materials, essential to such study,—the records of the Board of Trade, the Treasury and Admiralty papers, in the Public Record Office at London ; the manuscript collections of the British Museum and the Bodleian Library, and those calendared in the successive reports of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts ; the materials in the archives of the states and of outlying provinces like Nova Scotia, and in the cabinets of the historical societies ; and the records of ecclesiastical organizations, such as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

Professor H. L. Osgood of Columbia University expressed himself as very heartily in accord with the views of Professor Andrews. There was much need of a more thorough comparative study of colonial institutions. The old-time state historian, pursuing merely the history of his one colony, and usually the history of events rather than of institutions, had inevitably left the tale half told, more than half unexplained, and had cast little light on the historic forces operating on the colonies as a whole, the general tendencies of the time. Urging the comparative study of single institutions of the colonial period, each being traced in all the colonies, Mr. Osgood laid especial stress upon the need of a fuller study of

the royal province, the predominant form of colonial constitution. He spoke of the materials needing to be examined in such studies, and of the insufficient extent to which they had been made accessible in print. He agreed with Professor Andrews that the system of imperial control was very imperfectly known as yet, though it presented many opportunities for the elaboration of helpful monographs.

Speaking upon the general subject of neglected fields, and in the interest of young men to whom topics for monographic treatment are suggested by their elders, Professor J. F. Jameson of Brown University adverted to the danger of assuming that because a subject is greatly in need of satisfactory elucidation, it is therefore a desirable theme to assign to the junior student. Often such a student performs but one extensive piece of original work, his doctoral dissertation. Its topic should by all means be so chosen as to introduce him, in as varied ways as possible, into the knowledge of historical methods. Many topics, which sorely need treatment, are ineligible for this purpose, because the materials for their elaboration lie in sources of but a single sort. If possible, let subjects be chosen which lead into sources of many various kinds. Such are many biographical subjects; and the speaker especially commended, for the American student, biographies of persons whose careers will lead him into the history of several countries of Europe as well as of America. Such, also, are many topics in the history of religion in America.

An especially agreeable feature of this session was the presence of the Rev. Dr. William Cunningham, of Trinity College, Cambridge, who spoke briefly but interestingly of the condition of historical studies in England. He lamented that they had not a greater hold upon English attention, especially since there was so much still surviving to bring before the Englishman, and perhaps still more the Scotchman, the sense of his relation to the past. He gave several interesting instances, from the city of Edinburgh and the borough of Canongate, of survivals of those institutions of the later Middle Ages which had been discussed earlier in the session. He urged, in consonance with Professor Morse Stephens's remarks, the utility of such study of Scottish history as would enable one to compare, in their curious and instructive resemblances and differences, the institutions which the same race developed on the one and on the other side of the Border.

In the afternoon of the same day the Church History Section held a session unusually well attended. Three papers were read.

The first was an essay on *The Beginnings of Protestant Worship*, by Professor J. W. Richard, D.D., of Gettysburg, Pa. Dr.

Richard gave a detailed statement of the liturgical changes made in Wittenberg as the result of the reaction against the prevailing doctrinal conceptions. The account emphasized the leadership of Carlstadt, who is often obscured by the concentration of attention on Luther. Carlstadt's initiative determined the form and extent of the innovation by which the Roman mass became a German communion service. Local variations, wherever this example was followed, and Luther's refusal to insist on uniformity of ceremony, made liturgical differences as marked a trait of Lutheran churches as their fixity and uniformity of doctrine.

The paper on Erasmus by the Rev. Dr. George Norcross, of Carlisle, Pa., was not without elements of popular interest, but was primarily intended for another audience.

Professor Samuel Macauley Jackson's account of Zwingli and the Baptist party in Zurich gave prominence to the extremely cautious methods of this most radical of the reformers, and the cruelty and arrogance of his treatment of the Baptists who pressed their conclusions farther and at once brought their individual practice into agreement with their doctrine. The body of the paper dealt with Zwingli's literary polemic against the Baptists. A disputed point was fixed by a letter of Zwingli showing that torture had been applied, more than once, indeed, to Hübmaier. In remarks following the paper, Professor Jackson held that the Baptist party need not be traced to any prior historical movement in the circles of Waldensians or Franciscan tertiaries. The forming impulses came from Zwingli himself. When Scripture was asserted as sole authority and church practice subjected to criticism, every belief and usage was naturally made the subject of fresh revisions.

After the adjournment of this session the members were received by the president, Professor Fisher, at his house.

The session of Thursday evening was devoted to topics in the diplomatic history of America. Professor William M. Sloane of Columbia University read a paper on Napoleon's plans for French colonies in Spanish America. Professor George L. Burr of Cornell University, who conducted for the Venezuela-Guiana Boundary Commission nearly all of its elaborate historical researches, described the methods and the results of his search. Dr. J. M. Callahan of the Johns Hopkins University read a paper on the Diplomatic Relations of the Confederate States and England. The first two of these papers we are so fortunate as to be able to present in the present number of the REVIEW. The last paper of the evening was one by Professor Edwin A. Grosvenor of Amherst College on American Diplomacy, for which he aimed to vindicate an exceptionally high

place. He dwelt upon the abilities and successes of our diplomats abroad, from Franklin down, and of our Secretaries of State; and maintained that during the nineteenth century no country has contributed more than the United States to the development of international law. In discussion of his paper Professor S. M. Macvane asserted a marked decline in the quality of our representatives abroad, and a marked diminution of their successes, in the period after 1820.

But one more session was devoted entire to the reading of papers, that of Friday morning, December 30. Colonial history and policy was on this occasion the general topic. Under the title of "A Forgotten Danger to the New England Colonies," Dr. Frank Strong of Yale University related from original sources the story of Cromwell's project for transferring the inhabitants of New England to the West Indies. Professor Henry E. Bourne of the Western Reserve University developed "Some Lessons from the Recent History of European Dependencies." He examined the recent experience of the French, Dutch and English, first with respect to colonial tariffs and commercial regulations, and then with respect to the forms of colonial government and the organization of the colonial civil service. Great interest was aroused by the paper read by Judge Simeon E. Baldwin of the Yale Law School on the Constitutional Questions incident to the Acquisition and Government by the United States of Island Territory. But the paper was one which fell chiefly within the field of constitutional law and political science, and hardly at all within that of history, and the discussions which followed were discussions of constitutional interpretation and of public policy rather than of historical fact. Briefly, Judge Baldwin concluded for the power to acquire such territory, but urged the constitutional difficulties attending its administration, particularly in respect to the provisions of the Constitution relating to uniform tariffs and to trial by jury. Dr. James Schouler opposed the policy of annexation, Professor Hart advocated it.

In the afternoon, at the concluding session, Dr. Herbert Friedenwald, Superintendent of the Manuscripts Department in the Library of Congress, described the collections of historical manuscript possessed by that institution. Now that in the new building they can be brought together, a satisfactory arrangement effected and a catalogue begun, it is seen that there are about twenty-five thousand letters or other papers. Dr. Friedenwald described the steps taken or to be taken toward making them more accessible. They are chiefly of value to the colonial and revolutionary history of the United States, in a less degree to the history of the West Indies and British

America. The leading portions of the collection, as described, seem to be the following: a portion of the papers collected by George Chalmers; the Vernon-Wager papers, chiefly originating with Admiral Lord Vernon; a large collection of the papers of two British commissioners, Colonel Thomas Dundas and Mr. J. Pemberton, whose duty it was, between 1783 and 1790, to conduct minute inquiries into the losses, claims and services of the American Loyalists; the records of the Virginia Company and other early Virginian papers derived from the library of Jefferson; papers collected by Peter Force, relating to New Hampshire and other colonies (but Dr. Friedenwald reports that the continuation of Force's *Archives*, supposed to be possessed in manuscript by the Library of Congress, simply does not exist); a considerable mass of Delaware documents, especially of John Dickinson; the minutes of the Baltimore Committee of Safety, 1774-1776; those of the Council of Safety kept at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 1774-1777; a series of 214 press-copies of Washington's letters, 1793-1799; the letter-books and many documents of Rochambeau; papers of the Count de Ségur and of Governor Thomas Pownall; papers of Henry R. Schoolcraft, of General John Sullivan, of General Nathanael Greene, of Colonel Ephraim Blaine, of President Monroe, 1804-1806, of Du Simitière and of John Paul Jones. A calendar of the last and of the Washington manuscripts may, it appears, be expected to appear shortly.

It remains to speak briefly of those matters of business, mostly transacted on this last afternoon, which have not been mentioned already. The Council exercised its new function of electing members of the Board of Editors of this REVIEW by choosing Professor A. C. McLaughlin of the University of Michigan. Article IV. of the Constitution of the Association was amended in such manner that henceforth six members of the Executive Council are to be elected by the Association instead of four. The two members immediately added were Professor George B. Adams of Yale and Professor McLaughlin. Mr. James Ford Rhodes of Boston was elected president for the year 1899; the names of the other officers and of the members of the committee will be found upon the next page. Mr. Talcott Williams having resigned from the Historical Manuscripts Commission, his place was filled by the choice of Dr. Herbert Friedenwald. With respect to the place of subsequent meetings, the Executive Council by formal vote pronounced in favor of a definite plan of rotation, in accordance with which the Association will meet one year in some city of the East, the next year in some city of the West, and the third year in Washington, its official home. This vote might naturally have led to the selection of a

Western town for the meeting in Christmas week of 1899 ; but the inauguration of the scheme was postponed one year, and on December 27, 28 and 29 the Association will meet in Boston and Cambridge. The American Economic Association, on the other hand, will meet in Ithaca.

The *Annual Report* of the Association for 1897 makes its appearance just as this issue of the REVIEW goes to press.

It would be an act of great injustice to close this account of a most interesting and successful convention without recording the fact that its interest and success were due, in greater measure than to anyone else, to the members of the local committee of arrangements, and especially to its chairman, Professor Edward G. Bourne of Yale University.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

<i>President,</i>	James Ford Rhodes, Esq.
<i>First Vice-President,</i>	Edward Eggleston, Esq.
<i>Second Vice President,</i>	Professor Moses Coit Tyler.
<i>Secretary,</i>	Professor Herbert B. Adams.
<i>Assistant Secretary and Curator,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Esq.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence W. Bowen, Esq.
<i>Secretary of the Church History Section,</i>	Rev. Dr. Samuel M. Jackson.

Executive Council (in addition to the above named officers) :

Hon. Andrew D. White,
President Charles Kendall Adams,
Hon. William Wirt Henry,
President James B. Angell,
Henry Adams, Esq.,
Hon. George F. Hoar,
Rev. Dr. Richard S. Storrs,
James Schouler, Esq.,
Professor George P. Fisher,
Professor H. Morse Stephens,
Professor Frederick J. Turner,
Professor Albert Bushnell Hart,
Hon. Melville W. Fuller,
Professor George B. Adams,
Professor A. C. McLaughlin.

Committees (in the order of their origin) :

Historical Manuscripts Commission : Professor J. Franklin Jameson, chairman, Professor William P. Trent, Professor Frederick J. Turner, James Bain, Jr., Esq., Herbert Friedenwald, Esq.

Committee on the Study of History in Secondary Schools : Professor A. C. McLaughlin, chairman, Professor H. B. Adams, George L. Fox, Esq., Professor A. B. Hart, Professor C. H. Haskins, Professor Lucy M. Salmon, Professor H. Morse Stephens.

Committee on the Programme of the next Meeting : Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, chairman, Professors H. B. Adams, H. E. Bourne, W. A. Dunning, C. H. Haskins.

Committee on the Winsor Prize : Professor Frederick J. Turner, chairman, Professors C. M. Andrews, E. P. Cheyney, H. L. Osgood, C. L. Wells.

Committee on the History of Colonies and Dependencies : Professor Henry E. Bourne, chairman, Professors Bernard Moses, H. Morse Stephens, F. Wells Williams, G. M. Wrong.

General Committee : Professor H. B. Adams, chairman.

Committee on Bibliography : W. E. Foster, Esq., chairman, Messrs. A. Howard Clark, George Iles, J. N. Larned, R. G. Thwaites.